

SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

STANDING HEARING OFFICER DIRECTIVE

DOCKET NO. 2013-298-E

NOVEMBER 4, 2013

Standing Hearing Officer: David Butler

DOCKET DESCRIPTION:

Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Approval of New Cost Recovery Mechanism and Portfolio of Demand-Side Management and Energy Efficiency Programs

MATTER UNDER CONSIDERATION:

Joint Motion to Excuse Certain Witnesses from Attendance at Hearing

STANDING HEARING OFFICER'S ACTION:

All parties in the case except for the Office of Regulatory Staff ("ORS") (together, the "Joint Movants") have filed a Joint Motion to excuse certain out-of-state witnesses from attendance at the evidentiary hearing in this Docket, namely Dr. Richard G. Stevie for Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC ("Duke"), Kenneth E. Baker for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc. (together "Wal-Mart"), and Natalie Mims for the South Carolina Coastal Conservation League, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Sierra Club (together, the "Environmental Intervenors"). All parties have indicated that they would waive cross-examination of each of these witnesses and would not object to stipulating his or her testimony into the record. Dr. Stevie resides in Ohio, and the Joint Movants allege that his evaluation, measurement, and verification ("EMV") testimony shows that the process is unchanged from Duke's current EM&V process. Wal-Mart witness Mr. Baker resides in Arkansas and the Joint Movants allege that avoidance of Mr. Baker's travel expenses is a worthwhile goal, in the absence of the need for cross-examination. Finally, The Joint Movants allege that the Environmental Intervenors are non-profit organizations with limited resources, and that their witness, Ms. Mims, lives in California. They state that attending the hearing would entail significant travel expenses that could be avoided, in the absence of the need for cross-examination. ORS does not object to the Motion.

The Joint Motion is granted and the above-named witnesses are excused from attendance at the November 12, 2013 evidentiary hearing in this matter. Clearly, there is a lack of need

for cross-examination of these witnesses, and, accordingly, the resources of the parties would be conserved by excusing these witnesses from the hearing, which is a reasonable goal.